

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 15 and 28 have been amended. Claims 1 – 35 are currently pending.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

Claims 1 – 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,914,625 (“Anderson”). Claims 13 – 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson, in view of Li, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,802,383 (“Li”).

Claim 1 - 12

Claims 1 – 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Anderson. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 in response to this rejection. Claim 1 now requires an item presentation area, a set of user-selectable filters and the table of contents area, all of which are visible to a user at the same time on the display screen. According to the claim language, incident to “receiving a user input selecting one of said set of user-selectable filters,” the displayed items are divided “into one or more groups according to the selected filter” and displayed in an item presentation area with automatically generated group titles. At the same time, the display also presents “a listing of said one or more group titles in said second presentation area.” Anderson does not teach the claimed display.

To teach the claimed interface, the Office Action relies on Anderson, at column 9, lines 16 – 26, which reads:

Once images are displayed on the camera 110, the user may change which images are displayed by changing the category currently displayed. In a preferred embodiment, the user may instruct the camera to display a menu of category names on the camera's GUI and then select a particular category name using the

user interface of the camera 110. Once a particular category is selected, those images indexed in the category list 1110 under the selected category are displayed. If the user selects more than one category, only the image files that include all the selected categories are displayed.

Moreover, the Office Action relies on the disclosure of Anderson's claims 1 and 5 to demonstrate that the menu of category names and images from those categories are presented at the same time on the display screen. *See* Office Action at 3.

Assuming Anderson does in fact teach both displaying images and a menu of category names at the same time, Anderson still does not teach the interface recited by amended claim 1. Indeed, Anderson does not teach the three simultaneously displayed aspects of the claimed interface. At best, Anderson discloses items from a category and a menu from which the user may select another category. In contrast, claim 1 now requires that the user be presented each of (1) user-selectable filters, (2) a listing of group titles corresponding to the displayed items, and (3) an item presentation area for displaying both group titles and items of content. Because Anderson does not teach each and every aspect of amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 2-14, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 15 - 35

Claims 15 – 35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson in view of Li. Applicants have amended independent claims 15 and 28 in response to this rejection. First and foremost, claims 15 and 28 now include claim language similar to amended claim 1, and, thus, claims 15 and 28 are likewise patentable over the prior art for all the reasons that claim 1 is patentable. Like Anderson, Li does not teach an interface in which an

item presentation area, a set of filters and the table of contents area are visible to a user at the same time on the display screen.

Moreover, claim 15 and 28 now include additional limitations that are not present in either Anderson or Li. For instance, claim 15, as amended, requires “a filter selection area which displays at least a portion of a set of user-selectable filters, wherein said set of user selectable filters includes one or more primary filters, wherein said filter selection area displays at least a portion of a set of secondary filters incident to user selection of one of said one or more primary filters.” Neither reference teaches such primary and secondary filtering of the to-be grouped and displayed items. Regarding claim 28, this claim now requires “a filter selection area which displays at least a portion of a set of user-selectable filters, wherein said set of user selectable filters includes at least one filter enabling filtering based on date of creation and includes at least one filter enabling filtering based on keyword.” Neither of the references allows the user to select from these different varieties of filters. Because both prior art references fail to teach each and every element of the amended independent claims, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 15 and 28 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants also submit that dependent claims 16-27, which depend from claim 15, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 15. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 29-35, which depend from claim 28, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 28.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, claims 1 – 35 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Reckers/

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547